

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 36, 38-50 and 52-56 are pending in the application.

In this Amendment, Applicants have amended claims 36, 40, 49, and 50 and cancelled claims 1-16, 18-35, and 37 from further consideration in this application. Applicants are not conceding that the subject matter encompassed by claims 1-16, 18-50, and 52-56 prior to this Amendment is not patentable over the art cited by the Examiner. Claims 36, 40, 49, and 50 were amended and claims 1-16, 18-35, and 37 were cancelled in this Amendment solely to facilitate expeditious prosecution of the allowable subject matter noted by the Examiner. Applicants respectfully reserve the right to pursue claims, including the subject matter encompassed by claims 1-16, 18-50, and 52-56 as presented prior to this Amendment and additional claims, in one or more continuing applications.

Applicants would like to thank Examiner Whipple for holding a telephone interview with their representative, Janaki K. Davda, on Monday, April 21, 2008. Proposed claim amendments to claim 1 and the rejection citing the Challenger reference were discussed. Applicants' agreed to consider amending the claims to further describe the web content relationship information as suggested by Examiner Whipple. Examiner Whipple indicated that an RCE would need to be filed for the amendments to be entered. No other agreement was reached.

The arguments and amendments presented herein include the arguments and amendments Applicants discussed with the Examiner during phone interview dated April 21, 2008. Applicants submit that the arguments and amendments presented herein make the substance of the phone interview of record to comply with 37 CFR 1.133. If the Examiner believes that further information on the interview needs to be made of record to comply with the requirements, Applicants request the Examiner to identify such further information.

Claim 1 is objected to. Applicants respectfully submit that the objection is moot as claim 1 has been cancelled.

Claims 1, 4-11, 13-16, 18-23, 25-50, and 52-56 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Challenger et al. in view of what was well known in the art. Applicants respectfully traverse, but, in order to expedite prosecution, claims 36, 40, and 49 have been amended. Claims 1, 4-11, 13-16, 18-23, and 25-35 have been cancelled, and Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection is moot as to the cancelled claims.

Amended claim 36 describes storing a plurality of files in an electronic content library of an enterprise content management system, wherein the enterprise content management system provides workflow management of workflow processes; maintaining revision history data for at least one of the files stored in the electronic content library; publishing one or more of the files stored in the electronic content library using a web content manager linked to the enterprise content management system, wherein the web content manager is configured to manage information available on a website, wherein the web content manager allows web content relationship information to be defined, wherein the web content relationship information relates the web content into an ordered structure; checking-out a selected file from the electronic content library upon a user's request, wherein the selected file is revised by the user; checking-in an updated version of the selected file to the electronic content library; updating the revision history data in the electronic content library in response to the updated version of the selected file being checked-in; launching a workflow process to notify the web content manager of the updated version of the selected file based on a modification to the selected file; and, in response to the notification, publishing the updated version of the selected file using the web content stored in the electronic content library of the enterprise content management system and using the web content relationship information stored by the web content manager (e.g., Specification, paragraphs 35, 38, 39, 41; Figure 1A).

Amended claim 40 describes storing web-based and non-web-based electronic content and a plurality of workflow process definitions in an electronic content library of an enterprise content management system, wherein the enterprise content management system provides workflow management of a plurality of workflow processes defined by the plurality of workflow process definitions; and, in response to a change to the web-based electronic content stored in the electronic content library, invoking an event, wherein the event triggers a web content manager to perform at least one web-based activity, wherein the web content manager is linked to the enterprise content management system and is configured to manage information

available on a website and invoking a website integrity check workflow process that monitors the changed web-based electronic content for errors caused by the change (e.g., Specification, paragraphs (e.g., Specification, paragraphs 35, 48; Figure 2B).

Amended claim 49 describes storing published and non-published electronic content in an electronic content library; storing a plurality of workflow process definitions in the electronic content library; managing the published and non-published electronic content in a first content processor, wherein the first content processor is an enterprise content management system that provides workflow management of workflow processes defined by the plurality of workflow process definitions; managing the publication of the published electronic content in a second content processor, wherein the second content processor is a web content manager linked to the first content processor and configured to manage information available on a website; and invoking an event in response to a change to the published electronic content stored in the electronic content library, wherein the event triggers one or more of the plurality of workflow processes in the second content processor for performing at least one publication related activity, wherein one workflow process updates web content relationship information stored by the second processor, wherein the web content relationship information relates at least a portion of the electronic content managed by the first content processor into an ordered structure (e.g., Specification, paragraphs 35, 42).

On the other hand, the Challenger reference describes a web server and trigger monitor (Figure 7). Figure 2 of the Challenger reference describes an object dependence graph (ODG) that represents relationships between fragments and web pages (page 845, first paragraph under A.2). Figure 6 of the Challenger reference shows that the Trigger Monitor is the software which takes objects from one or more sources, constructs pages, and writes the constructed pages to one or more sinks (page 848, left column, first full paragraph). Whenever the Trigger Monitor is notified of a modification, addition, or deletion of one or more objects, it fetches new copies of the changed objects from one or more sources; the ODG is updated by parsing changed objects; the graph traversal algorithms are applied to determine all Web pages which need to be updated and efficient order for updating them; finally, bundles of published pages are written to the sinks (page 848, left column, second full paragraph).

Applicants respectfully submit that the Challenger reference in view of what was well known in the art does not teach or suggest the subject matter of amended claims 36, 40 or 49 or their dependent claims 38-39, 41-48, 50, and 52-56.

Claims 2-3 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Challenger and further in view of Yuen et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2003/0033037). Applicants respectfully traverse. However, Applicants will not address this rejection as claims 2-3 and 12 have been cancelled, and Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection is moot as to the cancelled claims.

Claim 24 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Challenger and further in view of Norin et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,794,253). Applicants respectfully traverse. However, Applicants will not address this rejection as claim 24 has been cancelled, and Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection is moot as to the cancelled claim.

Conclusion

For all the above reasons, Applicants submit that the pending claims are patentable. Should any additional fees be required beyond those paid, please charge Deposit Account No. 09-0460.

The attorney of record invites the Examiner to contact her at (310) 553-7973 if the Examiner believes such contact would advance the prosecution of the case.

Dated: April 30, 2008

By: /Janaki K. Davda/

Janaki K. Davda
Registration No. 40,684

Please direct all correspondences to:

Janaki K. Davda
Konrad Raynes & Victor, LLP
315 South Beverly Drive, Ste. 210
Beverly Hills, CA 90212
Tel: (310) 553-7973
Fax: 310-556-7984